



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,096	08/09/2001	Ghim-Sim Chua	50037.5USU1	3792

27488 7590 03/17/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,096

Applicant(s)

CHUA ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' RESPONSE filed on 12/28/2005.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. Claims 1-3, 6, 7-10, 13-16, 18-20, 21- 22, 24-28, 29, and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2002/0026443 A1 of Chang et al. (hereinafter Chang) in view of US Patent No. 6,327,590 issued to Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii).

With respect to claim 1, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components (figs. 5 & 10, sections 0053 and 0055-0056; also sections 0453-0463), comprising:

a search engine manager configured to receive a search query from a client and to translate the search query to a standard query, and to communicate the standard query from the search engine manager to a search engine wrapper (a combination of different types of search engines, which are registered search engines for being selectable by users in the system, configured for receiving the user search query (sections 0020, 0046 and 0680); and the search query is translated into several native queries that corresponds to each native database (figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456); and

to translate the standard query to a native format query associated with a registered search engines and to communicate the native format query to registered search engines (these search engines are registered in the system and are enabling for user to select his/her desired one and the query translation from search query into a native format query to go with the associated search engine in the searching process: fig. 10, and fig. 2, abstract, sections 0455-00456; also see sections 0020, 0046 and 0608).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 2, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1. Also, Chang teaches a client interface configured to allow the search engine manager to communicate with the client (figs. 4 and 10; GUI for receiving the client's query); a query generation module configured to receive the search query from the client interface and to generate the standard search query (fig. 5 and sections 0139, 0144, 0148 and 0151-0153).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a

native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 3, Chang teach a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 6, Chang teach a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 7, Chang teaches a computer-implemented method for communicating between a client and a plurality of search engines in a distributed processing system (figs. 5 & 10, sections 0053 and 0055-0056; also sections 0453-0463), comprising the step of:

- at a search engine manager (sections 0020 and 0303);
- receiving a search query having a plurality of search parameters, the search query being generated by a search client (fig. 10, sections 0453-0463);
- building a standard query from the search query (figs. 2, sections 0066-0067);
- receiving the standard query (fig. 10);
- translating the standard query to a native format query for a search engine associated with the search engine (these search engines are registered in the system

and are enabling for user to select his/her desired one and the query translation from search query into a native format query to go with the associated search engine in the searching process: fig. 10, and fig. 2, abstract, sections 0455-00456; also see sections 0020, 0046 and 0608);

issuing the native format query to the search engine associate with the search engine (sections 0455-0456).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking

search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claims 8-10, Chang teach a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teach search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 13, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps (figs. 5 & 10, sections 0053 and 0055-0056; also sections 0453-0463), comprising:

registering a search engine to provide searching capabilities (a plurality of various type of search engines, which are register for enabling user to use for search: sections 0020 and 0303);

receiving, at a search engine manager, a client query from a client (figs. 10 and figs 2 & 4-5; GUI, item 45, for user to enter search query)

building a standard query from the client query received from the client (figs. 10 & 5: query collection and query form);

passing the standard query from he search engine manager associated with the registered search engine (fig. 10, section 0453);

translating the standard query to a translated query in a native format of the registered search engine (abstract, section 0025, 0420, 0433 and 0455-0056);

transmitting the translated query to the registered search engine (fig. 10, items 47 and 48; sections 0453-0456); and

receiving results of the translated query from the registered search engine (fig. 2, item 49, section 0458).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating

transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach a wrapper associated with the search engine.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 14, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach an associated wrapper with a common registration service.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claims 15-16 and 20, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach a wrapper ID which uniquely identifies the associated wrapper, and storing other information, in a database associated with the common registration service; and a multiplicity of wrappers associated with other search engines to

receive the standard query.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 4, lines 15-54, col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 18, Chang teaches wherein building the standard query further comprises combining, by a query generation module, the client query with other parameters received from the client (figs. 10 & 5: query collection and query form).

With respect to claim 19, Chang teaches wherein translating the standard query further comprises transforming the standard query to the native format of the search engine through the use of a translation module (sections 0453-0456).

With respect to claim 21, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps (figs. 5 & 10, sections 0053 and 0055-0056; also sections 0453-0463), comprising:

discovering at least one search engine registered with a search system, receiving a query initiated by a client accessing the search system, building a standard query from the query initiated by the client, transmitting the standard query and to translate the standard query to a native format query associated with the at least one search engine registered with the search system, requesting a response from the at least one search engine wrapper the response including a progress update for the standard query as it is executed and the results of the standard query; and receiving the response (a combination of different types of search engines, which are registered search engines for being selectable by users in the system, configured for receiving the user search query (sections 0020, 0046 and 0680); and the search query is translated into several native queries that corresponds to each native database (figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456); these search engines are registered in the system and are enabling for user to select his/her desired one and the query translation from search query into a native format query to go with the associated search engine in the searching process: fig. 10, and fig. 2, abstract, sections 0455-00456; also see sections 0020, 0046 and 0608).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating

transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach a wrapper associated with the search engine.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 22, Chang teaches wherein discovering at least one search engine registered with the search system further comprises accessing a search engine store to retrieve identification information for the at least one search engine registered with the search system (figs. 5 & 10, abstract, sections 0020, 0046 and 0680; also sections 0455-0456).

With respect to claims 24-25, and 28, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 21.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach a search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 4, lines 15-54, col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 26, Chang teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query is complete (abstract, sections 0065 and 0067).

With respect to claim 27, Chang teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query failed because a time limit for receiving a response is exceeded (sections 0096-0098).

With respect to claim 29, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps (figs. 5 & 10, sections 0053 and 0055-0056; also sections 0453-0463), comprising:

receiving a standard query from a search engine manager; translating the standard query into a native format query associated with at least one search engine; transmitting the native format query associated with the at least one search engine to at least one search engine; transmitting a progress update to the search engine manager for the standard query as it is executed; receiving results from the at least one search engine; and transmitting the results received from the at least one search engine to the search engine manager a combination of different types of search engines, which are registered search engines for being selectable by users in the system, configured for receiving the user search query (sections 0020, 0046 and 0680); and the search query is translated into several native queries that corresponds to each native database (figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456); these search engines are registered in the system and are enabling for user to select his/her desired one and the query translation from search query into a native format query to go with the associated search engine in the searching process: fig. 10, and fig. 2, abstract, sections 0455-00456; also see sections 0020, 0046 and 0608).

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine, passing, translating transmitting and receiving results of the translated query from the search engine. Chang does not clearly teach a wrapper associated with the search engine.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (Chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 31, Chang teaches wherein translating the standard query into a native format query further comprises using a translation module (sections 0025 and 0420).

With respect to claim 32, Chang teaches wherein the native format query is different for each of the search engines when multiple search engines are used (sections 0453-0456).

With respect to claim 33, Chang teaches wherein transmitting the native format query further comprises dynamically altering parameters of the native format query according to the search engine (fig. 5, sections 0073-0076).

With respect to claim 34, Chang teaches wherein transmitting a progress update further comprises transmitting an identification parameter for identifying the at least one search engine (sections 0287 and 0534).

With respect to claim 35, Chang teaches wherein the at least one search engine is stopped from continuing to execute the native format query when a time limit for receiving a response is exceeded (sections 0096-0098).

With respect to claim 36, Chang teaches wherein transmitting the results received from the at least one search engine further comprises transmitting the results in response to a request for the results from the search engine manager (figs. 1 & 2, abstract, sections 0065-0067 and 0074-0078).

6. Claims 4-5, 11-12, 17, 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2002/0026443 A1 of Chang et al. (hereinafter Chang) in view of US Patent No. 6,327,590 issued to Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,430,552 issued to Corston-Oliver.

With respect to claims 4-5, Chang in view of Chidlovskii discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chang and Chidlovskii disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chang and Chidlovskii do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches using component object model, a software component such as Dynamically Linked Library (DLL) as a interface for allowing searching of many different search engines (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 6, lines 25-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang in view of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 11, Chang teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 7.

Chang and Chidlovskii disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chang and Chidlovskii do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches using component object model, a software component such as Dynamically Linked Library (DLL) as a interface for allowing searching of many different search engines (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 6, lines 25-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang in view of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 12, Chang teach a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 7.

Chang teaches employing a combination of different types of search engines being registered for enabling the user to select, and translating the search query into a native format query associated with the selected search engine. Chang does not clearly teaches search engine wrapper.

However, Chidlovskii teaches a wrapper to be used for transforming the query into a representation that is used by the application (col. 5, lines 8-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Chidlovskii, wherein the wrapper associated with search engines or meta-search

engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of multiple various registered search engines for enabling a user to select (Chang's figs. 2 & 10, abstract and sections 0455- 0456). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 17, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Chang and Chidlovskii disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chang and Chidlovskii do not teach wherein the standardized interface includes a COM (component object model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches using component object model, a software component such as Dynamically Linked Library (DLL) as a interface for allowing searching of many different search engines (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 6, lines 25-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang in view of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results

Art Unit: 2162

that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 23, Chang teaches a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 21.

Chang and Chidlovskii disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chang and Chidlovskii do not teach wherein the standardized interface includes a COM (component object model) interface.

However, Corston-Oliver teaches using component object model, a software component such as Dynamically Linked Library (DLL) as a interface for allowing searching of many different search engines (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 62-67, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 6, lines 25-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang in view of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Corston-Oliver by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of ranking search results that satisfy the user's search query (chidlovskii's col. 1, lines 8-12 and col. 2, lines 25-30).

With respect to claim 30, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 29.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not wherein receiving a standard query further comprises receiving the standard query through a COM interface.


However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **(initiating by written statements) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (Examiner's fax no.)**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY 
MAR. 6th, 2006